

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 60, 65, 67, 70, 74 and 75 are currently being amended.

This amendment changes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 53-75 are now pending in this application with claims 53-59 being withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 60-72 and 74 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In response, Applicants have amended claims 60, 65, 67, 70, 74 and 75 to recite at least an “information processing device.” Further, several of the claims recite an “information reproducing device” which, as described in the specification, may be a display. *See* p. 42, line 28 of the application.

Referring to Fig. 7, the specification states “[t]he computer (i.e., central processing unit, processor, and information processing device) 900 includes the information processing means 3, and the information changing means 5.” *See* p. 21, lines 1-4 (emphasis added). That is, the claimed information processing device can be a computer, CPU or processor, all of which are statutory subject matter.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, claims 60-72 and 74 are now tied to a particular machine or apparatus and therefore recite statutory subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn and claims 60-72 and 74 be allowed.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 60-64, 66-70 and 72-75 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,773,344 (“Gabai”) in view of NPL Document “Can Prosody aid the Automatic Classification of Dialog in Conversational Speech” (“Shriberg”). In response, Applicants traverse the rejection for the reasons set forth below.

Applicants rely on MPEP § 2143.03, which requires that all words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art. Here, the cited references do not identically disclose, teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *See In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).

Independent claim 60 is directed to “a method of processing information” comprising in addition to other elements “analyzing inputted text with an information analysis unit to determine information to be added comprising the steps of: classifying the inputted text as one of a plurality of types of sentences; selecting a category of additional information related to the type of sentence; and selecting additional information in the selected category” (emphasis added). Independent claims 67 and 73-75 recite similar limitations.

For the aid of the Examiner in understanding the claimed method and system, and in particular the “selecting a category of additional information related to the type of sentence” feature, Applicants refer the Examiner to a non-limiting exemplary embodiment described in the specification as filed with respect to Fig. 4.

FIG. 4 shows an example of the information changing means 5, which adds information. The information changing means 5 shown in FIG. 4 includes a change processing unit 51, an additional-information generating unit 52, and a control unit 53. The additional-information generating unit 52 includes an information analysis unit 521, a retrieval unit 522, and a memory 523. The change processing unit 51 receives the result of information processing from the information processing means 3 and actually adds information. The additional-information generating unit 52 receives the result of information processing from the information processing means 3 via the change processing unit 51. The additional-information generating unit 52 then generates information that the change

processing unit 51 will add. The control unit 53 controls the generation of additional information, which is performed in the additional-information generating unit 52, and the addition of information, which is carried out in the change-processing unit 51. The information analysis unit 521 analyzes the information, i.e., the result of information processing, which has been received from the information processing 3 via the retrieval unit 522. The information analysis unit 521 then determines which information should be added. The analysis is composed of a step of classifying the information supplied, a step of selecting a category for the additional information, and a step of selecting the additional information.

In the step of classifying the information supplied, the meaning of the information is interpreted and the information is classified as a question, an explanation, or the like. If the information supplied is a sentence such as "Is it . . . ?", "Whether . . . is questionable . . . " or the like, it is classified as a question. If it is a sentence such as "This point is explained as being . . . ", "It is considered to be . . . " or the like, it is classified as an explanation.

In the step of selecting a category for the additional information, a category of the additional information is selected, which is suitable as a question or an explanation. For example, an expression prompting an answer to a question can be added to a question, and an expression confirming understanding or communication can be added to an explanation. The expression prompting an answer is, for example, "Please respond to . . . ". The expression confirming under standing or communication is, for example, "Do you understand?" or "Do you hear it?"

In contrast, the cited references do not disclose, teach or suggest each and every element recited in independent claims 60, 67 and 73-75.

Gabai is directed to interactive toys. However, "selecting a category of additional information related to the type of sentence" as claimed is not the same as explaining the cultural significance of dishes on a translated menu as disclosed in Gabai. In addition, the Office Action acknowledges that Gabai fails to explicitly disclose "classifying the inputted text as one of a plurality of types of sentences" and "selecting a category of additional information related to the type of sentence" as claimed in claim 60. *See* Office Action at p. 6.

To cure the deficiencies of Gabai, the Office Action relies on Shriberg. This contention is respectfully traversed.

In particular, it is submitted that secondary citation to Shriberg does not remedy the conceded deficiency in the primary citation to Gabai. Shriberg is directed to a study for identifying verbal utterances using prosodic information such as duration, pause, speaking rate, etc. Specifically, page 8 of Shriberg discloses a table that lists utterances in the far right column. In the far left column, the type of utterance is specified. For example, Shriberg discloses that the utterance “[d]o you have to have any special training?” is a “Yes/No” type of question.

The Office Action asserts that the table identifying categories relating to the type of sentence such as a “Yes/No” question is equivalent to the claimed step of “selecting a category of additional information related to the type of sentence” as claimed. Applicants respectfully disagree. As stated above, the step of “selecting a category of additional information related to the type of sentence” can include, for example, selecting an expression prompting an answer to a question or selecting an expression confirming understanding. That is, identifying a type of sentence as disclosed in Shriberg is not the same as selecting a category of additional information as claimed, where that additional information will then be added to the inputted text.

When determining whether a claim is obvious, an examiner must make “a searching comparison of the claimed invention – *including all its limitations* – with the teaching of the prior art.” *In re Ochiai*, 71 F.3d 1565, 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (emphasis added). Thus, “obviousness requires a suggestion of all limitations in a claim.” *CFMT, Inc. v. Yieldup Intern. Corp.*, 349 F.3d 1333, 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (citing *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 985 (CCPA 1974)). Here, the cited references fail to disclose each and every limitation in as complete detail as is contained in independent claims 60, 67 and 73-75.

Claims 61-66 and 68-72 depend from one of independent claims 60 or 67 and should be allowed for the reasons set forth above without regard to further patentable limitations contained therein.

If this rejection of the claims is maintained, the examiner is respectfully requested to point out where the above-mentioned features are disclosed in the cited references.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.


The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing or a credit card payment form being unsigned, providing incorrect information resulting in a rejected credit card transaction, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 1/22/2010

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6014
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By 

George C. Beck
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,072

W. Keith Robinson
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 59,396